

TOWARD A REINVENTED FUTURE FOR JUVENILE PROBATION

Having considered the characteristics of probation and the ideologies and research guiding its practice, this section now considers some of the procedures commonly undertaken by probation professionals. It is organized around the seven key strategies for a rational probation system recommended by the Reinventing Probation Council (2000b). While many of these procedures are typically used in probation, this section will strive to point out “promising practices” and programs that are particularly forward-thinking in their application.

Strategy #1: Place Public Safety First

The Reinventing Probation Council (2000b) defines public safety as “the extent to which persons and property are free from attack or theft, that is, from the threat or risk of harm in particular places at particular times” (p. 20). To accomplish this, probation must be proactive in its strategies and use community-centered and neighborhood-based approaches. Emerging methods for achieving this broadened mission will be discussed subsequently.

However, the Reinventing Probation Council (2000b) also states that “targeting individual criminal offenders for correction or confinement will forever remain a necessary but not a sufficient response if the goal is to provide the citizenry with assurances of public and personal safety” (p. 20). This is the point at which this examination of probation practices begins. Based on the “What Works” literature, lower risk offenders are, as a group, much less likely to continue to commit criminal offenses, and the focus of probation’s efforts and resources should be on identifying and effectively supervising higher risk youth. Correctly identifying, and successfully working with high risk juveniles leads to decreased criminal behavior and, thus, greater public safety. Risk and needs assessment and case classification are important tasks within probation. Regardless of where probation activities are conducted, surveillance and treatment efforts need to be focused on

Petersilia, 1998,
p. 34

. . .no other justice agency is involved with the offender and his case as comprehensively as the probation department. Every other agency completes their work, and hands the case over to the next decision maker. . . .but the probation department interacts with all of these agencies, provides the data that influences each of their processing decisions, and takes charge of the offender’s supervision at any point when the system decides to return the offender to the community.

those at highest risk of reoffending, and to do that, probation must use appropriate assessment and classification strategies.

Risk and Needs Assessment of Offenders

The characteristics and situations of youth entering the juvenile justice system are quite diverse. Youth may enter the juvenile justice system as a result of committing acts that are considered status or delinquent offenses, including property and violent crimes. They range in age from early to late adolescence. Some have previous records of juvenile justice involvement, while others do not. Many have problems with school, family, drugs and alcohol, and/or peer relationships. At the same time, there are significant challenges facing juvenile justice professionals who must protect the public, effect changes in youth, and manage resources wisely. Case assessment, classification, and management is basically a process of appraising and “sorting” youth into various groups and then making decisions about their placement for custody, supervision, and treatment based on these findings.

Assessment and classification often address multiple levels of decision-making, ranging from the individual juvenile, to the program or agency, and even to the wider jurisdictional level. Not only does assessment and classification occur at each level, but the way in which it is implemented and the results of the procedures are often interwoven among the various components and tiers of the juvenile justice system.

At the individual level, Palmer (1984) asserts that the purpose of justice system intervention includes both *socially-centered* and *offender-centered* goals. The socially-centered goal is to modify a youth’s behavior so it conforms to the law, and therefore promotes the protection of society. To do this, however, offender-centered goals, such as attitudinal changes and increased coping ability, must be achieved, resulting in modification of the offender’s behavior and a better adjustment between the youth and his or her environment. Therefore, the most appropriate fit between the offender’s risks and needs and treatment resources must be achieved. Palmer claims that assessment and classification should both predict and prescribe the needs and treatment approaches best suited for a youth.

Juvenile crime presents diverse risks to public safety and the well-being of citizens. To address these risks and protect the public (as well as the youth involved) varying levels of resources are required. The backgrounds, offenses, and needs of youth in the juvenile justice system differ widely. Ideally, each jurisdiction has an array of services designed to intervene

appropriately with each youth, ranging from prevention through aftercare services. OJJDP's *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* identified a continuum of juvenile justice interventions and sanctions needed to comprise a comprehensive system (Wiebush, Baird, Krisberg, & Onek, 1995; Wilson & Howell, 1993), including the following:

- Prevention
- Early intervention
- Immediate assessment of and intervention with first-time and nonviolent offenders
- A range of intermediate sanctions for first time violent and repeat property and drug offenders
- Steadily escalating sanctions, security, and treatment for serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders
- Small, secure facilities for chronic or violent offenders
- Graduated and comprehensive aftercare services

A process of assessment and classification is essential for matching offenders' risks and needs with the appropriate type of services along this continuum. Two fundamental reasons for using a formal assessment and classification system are asserted (National Council on Crime and Delinquency [NCCD], 1997, p. 4; Wiebush et al., 1995, p. 174). They include:

- Providing greater validity, structure, and consistency to the assessment and decision-making processes; and
- A more efficient allocation of limited system resources by targeting the most intensive/intrusive interventions on the most serious, violent and chronic offenders.

In addition, as stated by Gottfredson (1987), programming and policy decisions often depend on assessment and classification procedures. Resources are always limited, and classification systems help channel youth into the least restrictive, least intrusive, and usually least expensive program resources that reasonably can be expected to control and change their behavior and protect the public. Within programs, youth often need to be divided into groups where their needs are similar to others within the same group. Then each group is provided with similar services that can be expected, within reasonable limits, to produce the desired outcome. Classification also helps programs and jurisdictions identify youth with greater and lesser potential for continued involvement in criminal justice. Armed with such information, more effective planning can be accomplished to prepare sufficient program resources for youth. Finally, program evaluation is connected to assessment and classification. Once youth are directed to the appropriate programs and sub-groups within

programs, it is expected that the socially-centered and offender-centered goals will be achieved successfully. These goals can be measured for program evaluation purposes, and if necessary, program components can be adapted to more closely accomplish these goals.

Peters (1988, p. 1) summarizes the rationale for case assessment and classification by saying, “. . .a supervision classification system is the agency’s primary mechanism for organizing staff and other agency resources, [and] it is the central tool for implementing supervision policy and making agency mission operational.”

Key objectives of juvenile probation are unlikely to be met fully without the benefit of assessment and classification. Table 12 provides a brief description of several important terms for understanding case assessment, classification, and management. These will be expanded further as this section develops.

Table 12	EXPLANATION OF KEY TERMS
Risk assessment	The process of using an empirically based, standardized, objective instrument to evaluate a youth's background and current situation and estimate the likelihood that the youth will continue to be involved in delinquent behavior. In community corrections, the results of risk assessment may be used to specify the level or intensity of supervision needed; in residential settings, risk assessment results may determine security level and living unit (Clear & Gallagher, 1983; Wiebush et al., 1995).
Needs assessment	A systematic process of identifying offender needs and problems, their severity, and whether they are chronic or crisis needs, and then using the information to determine the specific program interventions to be used for the youth (Krisberg, Neuenfeldt, Wiebush, & Rodriguez, 1994; Peters, 1988; Wiebush et al., 1995).
Prediction	A determination of behavior that can be expected in the future based on past behavior. Behaviors that occur less frequently, such as violence, are more difficult to predict, because there are fewer data upon which to determine a statistical probability that the behavior will be repeated (Gottfredson, 1987; Limandri & Sheridan, 1995; NCCD, 1997)
Override	The process of overruling or changing classifications when factors are present that outweigh the category indicated by usual risk and needs assessment instruments. Mandatory overrides provide for automatic changes in classification when certain characteristics are present. Discretionary overrides allow staff to make exceptions in classification when they detect circumstances that are not captured by the risk or needs assessment instruments (Krisberg et al., 1994; Wiebush et al., 1995).
Case classification	The arrangement or grouping of persons according to a system, principles, or rules. Persons within a class are similar to each other but different from members of other groups. Assignment of individuals to predetermined groups (Gottfredson, 1987).
Case management	The system by which an organization applies resources to meet client goals. Case management decisions affect allocation of resources, levels of service delivery and budgetary practices (Burrell, 1998; Fulton, Stone & Gendreau, 1994).

Clear (1978) stated that case management is a process through which organizations apply resources to clients to meet organizational goals. For example, Wiebush et al. (1995) suggest that agencies emphasizing public safety and risk control will use risk assessments to determine supervision strategies, while agencies stressing a balance between public safety and youths' treatment needs will consider both the risk and needs assessment when determining a case plan. Case classification and management systems are tools for effective service delivery. Those involved in developing these programs must have a clear understanding of what they are doing and why they are doing it (Burrell, 1998).

Table 13 provides an overview of some of the major goals of case assessment, classification and management that have been identified through literature reviews. This is not an exhaustive list, but may provide planners with ideas for selecting their program purpose and goals.

Table 13 POSSIBLE GOALS AND APPLICATIONS FOR CASE ASSESSMENT, CLASSIFICATION, AND MANAGEMENT	
Type of Goal/Purpose	Possible Applications
1. To determine case plans for individual youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct individualized assessment of each youth • Assess risk of recidivism • Channel youth to programs and/or levels of supervision that best meet their needs and control risks • Ensure youth are receiving equitable and consistent treatment compared to others with similar risks and needs • Match identified needs with available resources • Ensure that certain types of problems are considered for all cases • Provide data for future monitoring of the case • Identify youth for whom further in-depth assessments are needed <p>(Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994; Guarino-Ghezzi & Byrne, 1989; Krisberg, et al., 1994; NCCD, 1999)</p>
2. To allocate resources appropriately and implement effective supervision policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct most intensive interventions to the most serious, violent, and chronic offenders • Set priorities for case plans • Organize staff and other agency resources • Determine workloads <p>(Clear & Gallagher, 1983; Howell, 1995; Krisberg et al., 1994; NCCD, 1997; Wiebush et al., 1995)</p>
3. To provide justification and accountability for case decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reassessment and evaluation of effectiveness of case plans and program strategies • Provide equal, nondiscriminatory treatment <p>(Krisberg et al., 1994; NCCD, 1997; Wiebush et al., 1995)</p>

4. To enhance other parts of the juvenile justice system	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop formalized procedures, such as sentencing guidelines• Provide recommendations to juvenile court (e.g., through pre-dispositional reports) (NCCD, 1997; Wiebush et al., 1995)
5. To gather program data and evaluate programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Collect uniform statistical data on results of assessments and provision of services• Use data for planning, monitoring and evaluation of programs (Krisberg et al., 1994; NCCD, 1997)
6. To conduct research on programs and juveniles	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Test hypotheses about programs and youth (Gottfredson, 1987)

Juvenile probation agencies are most often involved in decision making at detention and following adjudication if the youth is placed on probation. At detention, although information may be limited, decisions must be reached about whether juveniles pose a danger to the community or themselves and whether or not there is a risk they will abscond before their court hearing, if released. In community corrections, a youth must be assessed and classified according to risks for continued delinquency and needs for program services.

Table 14 provides a summary of the reasons, risk measures, and processes related to classification within juvenile detention and community corrections programs.

Table 14

**SUMMARY OF CLASSIFICATION IN JUVENILE DETENTION
AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

Juvenile Justice Component	Reasons for Classifying Youth	Primary Risk Measures	Processes
Detention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community safety • Youth's personal safety • Risk of failing to appear for court hearing • Population management • Program evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seriousness of current offense • Recency and frequency of prior offenses • Whether youth was under court supervision at time of current offense • Stability measures (e.g., a history of escapes or runaways). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk Assessment • Confinement or Release
Community-based Corrections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probation • Aftercare/ Parole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public safety/risk control (risk of recidivism) • Youth's service needs (for habilitation/ rehabilitation) • Management of resources • Program Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age at first referral/adjudication • Prior out-of-home placements • Prior arrests • Academic achievement • School behavior and attendance • Substance abuse • Family stability • Parental control • Peer relationships <p>(Additional risk factors often are included. Assessment of needs also may be conducted and factored into decisions.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk and Needs Assessment • Determination of supervision level (e.g., number and type of contacts) • Development of case plan; determination of services to be provided

Sources: Burrell, 1998; NCCD, 1997; Parent et al., 1994; Torbet, 1986; Wiebush et al., 1995; Wright, 1988.

Assessment instruments are standardized tools comprised of a limited set of factors that are most relevant to the type of decision being made (e.g., treatment, incapacitation, supervision).

For effective case classification, these instruments should be administered to all cases, and the results should be used to classify youth according to pre-set criteria (Howell, 1995; NCCD, 1997; Wiebush et al., 1995).

Effective classification requires prediction through which knowledge of past events is used to form expectations of future behavior. As Gottfredson (1987, p. 6) states, "We must live

forward but seek to understand backward.” Prediction is really a summary of the past to guide future decisions, assuming there will be a degree of consistency over time (Gottfredson, 1987). Therefore, assessments use demographic, criminal, and behavioral characteristics to “sort” youth according to their anticipated level of misconduct (Wright, 1988).

Actuarial and clinical assessments may be used to classify youth. Clinical methods depend on the experience and more subjective judgments of the individual assessor. Actuarial methods rely on probabilities to discriminate among potential rates of future behaviors or events, similar to the types of calculations used to determine insurance premiums. Predictions are based on objective, standardized and empirical risk measures, including historical data on offender characteristics and outcomes (Boone & Fulton, 1995; Clear & Gallagher, 1983; NCCD, 1997). Prediction is an important concept in assessment and classification. Prediction, in this instance, is related to the notion of probability which implies an event is likely, but not certain, to occur. Probability is determined by statistical analysis of comparable cases with the same characteristics. In other words, a youth’s future behavior is forecast based on the known outcomes of a similar group of youth.

Assessment instruments are effective in predicting that most youth within a certain classification group will act in anticipated ways (e.g., recidivate, successfully complete treatment). However, they will not always accurately predict an individual youth’s behavior (Clear & Gallagher, 1983). Nevertheless, they provide an effective tool for classifying and managing caseloads of youth.

Risk assessment instruments “estimate the likelihood that an identified juvenile offender will subsequently commit another offense within a specified follow-up period, and are based on the statistical relationship between youth characteristics and recidivism” (Wiebush et al., 1995). Historical data on offender traits and outcomes are used to establish which factors are most closely linked with unfavorable case outcomes (NCCD, 1997). Two categories of risk factors are related to criminal activity: prior criminal history and stability factors (Krisberg et al., 1994). Factors associated with each of these categories are listed in Table 15.

Table 15

FACTORS RELATED TO RECIDIVISM

History	Stability
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• age at first referral/adjudication• number of prior offenses• current offense• prior assaults• abuse/neglect victimization• gender• prior adjustment to supervision	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• substance abuse• number of prior out-of-home placements or commitments• family relationships, stability, and parental control• school problems (achievement, behavior, attendance)• peer relationships• special education placement• mental health stability• runaway

Source: Krisberg et al., 1994; Torbet, 1986; Wiebush et al., 1995.

Historical factors are considered static, as they are fixed in time and cannot be changed (Boone & Fulton, 1995). The first two listed in Table 15 -- age and prior offenses -- are considered core variables identified repeatedly by research studies as predictors for juvenile recidivism. The other five historical factors are also included in several risk instruments (Wiebush et al., 1995).

Stability or dynamic factors may be amenable to change with appropriate interventions (Boone & Fulton, 1995). The first five areas listed in Table 15 -- substance abuse, placements, family stability and control, school problems, and peer relationships -- comprise core factors associated with juvenile recidivism. The remainder also are incorporated in some risk assessment instruments (Wiebush et al., 1995).

Seriousness of juvenile offenses has not been found in research studies to be strongly correlated with a probability of future offending. In fact, some studies have shown an inverse relationship (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994; Wiebush et al., 1995). Although risk assessment instruments are usually reliable for predicting general rates of recidivism among groups of juveniles, they are not as effective in estimating recidivism for specific types of crime, especially violent crimes. The incidence of violent crimes is relatively low, and it is difficult to

statistically isolate factors that will differentiate accurately between youth who will and will not commit violent offenses (Wiebush et al., 1995).

Risk assessment instruments are commonly used to determine supervision levels for youth on probation.

Detention Screening Instruments. Instruments used to determine whether or not a youth should be placed in detention typically focus on the juvenile's immediate threat to public safety and likelihood of fleeing prior to the court hearing. Two categories of measures are usually contained on detention screening instruments: public safety risk and stability. Table 16 lists common examples in each category (Howell, 1995; Wiebush et al., 1995).

Table 16

DETENTION SCREENING INSTRUMENT CATEGORIES

Public Safety Risk	Stability
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• current offense (including level of violence);• recency and frequency of prior offenses;• whether or not the juvenile was under court supervision when the current offense was committed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• out-of-home placements• substance abuse

Source: Howell, 1995; Weibush et al., 1995.

Needs assessment instruments are used to identify serious offender problems, and the results are used to match youth with appropriate programs. These instruments basically provide a description of a juvenile's functioning. Need items are factors or characteristics that can be changed with intervention. The instruments generally are developed through a consensus process rather than through research (Howell, 1995; Wiebush et al., 1995).

Items most frequently addressed in needs assessment instruments include (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994; Howell, 1995; Wiebush et al., 1995):

- substance abuse
- family functioning and relationships
- emotional stability
- school attendance

- peer relationships
- health/hygiene
- cognitive/intellectual ability or achievement
- learning disability

Other measures included in some needs assessment instruments are (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994; Howell, 1995; Wiebush et al., 1995):

- parents' problems (e.g., substance abuse, mental health, criminality)
- parenting skills
- housing/residential stability
- financial resources
- child abuse or neglect
- sexual adjustment
- vocational/employment concerns
- involvement in structured activities
- independent living skills
- communication skills

For whichever items are selected for a needs assessment instrument, it is vital that there be clear definitions and scoring criteria to achieve consistency in assessments (Howell, 1995; Wiebush et al., 1995).

A significant amount of research on assessment instruments has been undertaken, and several good instruments have been developed for juvenile and adult populations. Existing assessment instruments can be adopted for specific jurisdictions or programs. However, risk assessment instruments should be validated at a local level. To do this, a risk assessment instrument is administered to a sample population, and recidivism rates of the population are tracked.

If necessary, the points or weights assigned to certain levels may be changed to more accurately reflect the characteristics correlated with recidivism. Additional items also may be

Examples of Assessment Instruments
Arizona Juvenile Risk Assessment Form
Psychopathy Checklist - Revised
Sentencing Factors Inventory
Wisconsin Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Assessment Form
Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory

added to the tool if they are found to occur with substantial frequency among the sample population (NCCD, 1997).

A list of some available offenders assessment instruments is included in Appendix 2. This does not represent an exhaustive list of such instruments nor an endorsement of any that are included in the list.

Case classification and management are both the purpose for and outcomes of client assessment procedures. Classification and management are very similar concepts that often overlap in practice. However, for clarity, they will be discussed separately. Case classification is considered here, and case management will be discussed in a later segment of this section. All policies should be written and included with other agency policies.

The process of classification involves grouping youth with similar characteristics, usually determined by their score on assessment instruments (Clear & Gallagher, 1983). Case classification, based on structured assessment processes, promotes rational, consistent, and equitable methods of supervising and providing services for clients (Peters, 1988). Depending on the type of correctional program, juveniles are placed in detention or released, assigned levels and types of community supervision, and provided with specific services based on their classification.

There are several tasks that should be undertaken and decisions that must be made to develop an effective classification policy. These include the following:

- Set clear criteria for client eligibility or placement in various programs or levels of intervention. Determine the number of levels of supervision. Establish standards for supervision that differ substantially for each level. In general, those at the highest risk level should receive the most intensive services (NCCD, 1997; Peters, 1988; Wiebush et al., 1995);
- Determine which assessment instrument (e.g., risk, needs) will be given precedence in determining a youth's classification, or develop a system for integrating the results of two types of assessments. Some jurisdictions or programs use a matrix system that takes both risks and needs into consideration (Peters, 1988);
- Select cutoff scores for assessment instruments that will result in appropriate workload levels for staff, least restrictive program placement for youth, and protection of youth, staff and the public (Clear & Gallagher, 1983; Parent et al., 1994);

- Decide how frequently cases will be reassessed and reclassified. With youth, reassessments often occur every 90 days. At reassessment and classification, the youth's adjustment should be recognized rather than a strict reliance on risk factors (Peters, 1988; Torbet, 1986; Wiebush et al., 1995);
- Decide when, where, and how assessment and classification will be completed and who will take responsibility for the process (Peters, 1988);
- Establish a method whereby staff may override a youth's assessment score if a different level of supervision, security, or programming is deemed necessary. Overrides may be mandatory (i.e., if a certain condition exists, they must be placed at a different level regardless of the overall score) or discretionary (i.e., staff may consider factors that are not captured in the risk or need assessment instruments). There also should be a limit on the number of overrides in the classification system. Some suggest no more than 15 percent should result from overrides (Krisberg et al., 1994; Wiebush et al., 1995).

Torbet (1986, p. 2) lists five factors that are essential for successful implementation of a classification system. These are:

1. Scoring should be simple;
2. The rationale must be readily apparent and accepted by staff as well as administrators;
3. Staff should be allowed to make subjective judgments that override classification decisions;
4. Periodic reassessments should reflect changes in the client's problem, needs and/or risks;
5. Classification should be incorporated into the agency's record keeping system for monitoring, evaluation and planning purposes.

When a young person is assessed and classified at a particular level of risk, security, and/or need, a corresponding case management approach should be implemented. Case management helps match youth with program alternatives that are most likely to effect behavior change. It also helps determine the level of resources that should be devoted to the case. Additionally, the youth's progress and the effectiveness of the case plan can be evaluated (Gottfredson, 1987; Torbet, 1986).

At the program, agency, or jurisdictional level, case assessment, classification, and management have many applications. There are a variety of benefits that accrue through the case management process. These include (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994; Clear & Gallagher, 1983; Torbet, 1986; Wiebush et al., 1995):

- information for setting priorities among many competing needs;
- ability to develop workload standards and requirements for staff;

- mechanisms for evaluating case plans and services provided; and
- aggregate data for planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation.

There are many potential benefits from a program of client assessment, classification, and management. The lists below describe benefits that may accrue to youth, staff, and the program, agency or jurisdiction from implementation of a classification system. In some cases, an item might benefit more than one area, but each is listed only once.

Benefits to Youth

- Consistent and equitable treatment of all youth
 - More accurate assessments
 - Promotes serving youth in least restrictive environment
- (Fulton, Stone, & Gendreau, 1994; Howell, 1995; Wiebush et al., 1995)

Benefits to Staff

- Ensures the same factors are considered in all cases
 - Promotes consistency in the assessment process
 - Increases validity of assessment process because instruments are empirically based
 - Instruments are easy to complete
 - Saves time and paperwork
 - The decision making process is expedited
 - Rationale for decisions is explicit
 - Provides support for professional judgments
 - There are clear policies and procedures for handling cases
 - Provides a degree of legal protection in decisions on controversial cases
- (Fulton, Stone, & Gendreau, 1994; Howell, 1995; NCCD, 1997; Wiebush et al., 1995)

Benefits to Program, Agency, or Jurisdiction

- Increased public safety
 - More efficient use of resources
 - Useful for program evaluation
 - Helps control populations in detention and correctional institutions
 - Defends budgeting decisions
 - Facilitates agency or program accreditation
 - Facilitates agency audits
- (Fulton, Stone, & Gendreau, 1994; Howell, 1995; Wiebush et al., 1995)

Although there are many benefits, decision makers also need to consider possible consequences of an assessment, classification and management system. For example, it may be possible for staff to rely too heavily on the quantitative components of the classification process, neglecting the case planning and case management functions that are more difficult (Klein, 1989). Similarly, Torbet (1986) cautions that using a case assessment, classification, and management system to set caseload contact standards may lead to *minimum* standards becoming the norm, resulting in the provision of less effective services. Another concern is that using statistical prediction methods will inevitably result in some errors in classification.

Professional judgments are still a very important part of the process. Values and ethics remain vital to service provision (Gottfredson, 1987). It is also crucial to remember that part of adolescent development includes characteristics such as impulsiveness and inconsistency. Youth's needs and behavior patterns may change quickly, calling for adjustment of case plans. Prediction through case assessment instruments cannot be considered a long term prognosis, nor should case plans be unalterable (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994).

Juvenile Assessment Centers

Florida has developed a series of Juvenile Assessment Centers throughout the state to serve as a centralized intake system. All youth charged with felonies, misdemeanors, or truancy may be brought to the centers by law enforcement officers. The purpose of the centers is to provide a multidisciplinary screening and assessment of each youth and to refer them for the services they need. Key components of Juvenile Assessment Centers include (Springer, Shader, & McNeece, 1999):

- a central point of contact and transfer for law enforcement agencies,
- one-stop secure booking and receiving for offenders,
- continuous operation (24-hours, seven days a week),
- immediate assessment for both placement and service needs,
- ongoing case management and client tracking,
- integrated computer systems with linkages to key agencies in the juvenile justice system, and
- some needed services available on site.

One recent evaluation of the Florida Juvenile Assessment Centers found that “the operation of multi-agency centers has the potential to bring many benefits, but also brings organizational stress and complications (Springer, Shader, & McNeece, 1999, p. 59). The researchers

recommend establishing written responsibilities and standard operating procedures and developing effective cooperation and communication among all agencies involved.

Suggested Reading

Hoge, R. D., & Andrews, D. A. (1996). <i>Assessing the Youthful Offender: Issues and Techniques</i> . New York: Plenum Press.

Other Assessments by Probation

In the context of community and restorative justice, the issue of assessment must go beyond the assessment of offenders. Probation professionals may need to become proficient in assessing both the community and victims. A discussion of community partnerships later in this paper will briefly address community assessment. In the remainder of this segment, issues surrounding victim assessment will be summarized.

Often, probation professionals who are responsible for conducting predispositional investigations of offenders also are charged with collecting victim impact information. This can be an important part of repairing the harm experienced by victims. Godwin & Seymour (1999) list important practices for victim impact statements, including:

- providing all victims with the opportunity to submit or update victim impact information;
- making available different methods for victims to provide impact information, such as written statements, audio or video tapes, telephone statements, and electronic mail;
- providing culturally sensitive and age-specific opportunities for victims to make their statements, as well as ways for non-English speaking victims to take part in the process;
- incorporating victim impact information in the agency's management information system, but ensuring confidentiality of victim contact information; and
- providing training to all parts of the criminal justice system on how victim impact information should be collected and used appropriately.

The types of information that should be collected through victim impact statements include (Godwin & Seymour, 1999):

- the emotional impact of the crime on the victim,
- social and family relationships affected by the offense;
- the victim's concerns for safety and security;

- physical injuries resulting from the crime; and
- the victim's financial status and the costs associated with the crime.

Victims may need help from an advocate in completing the victim impact statement, and probation professionals should provide or help victims gain access to such assistance. A common problem with gathering victim impact information is not being able to locate the victim. However, agencies should have policies and procedures in place that require staff to work diligently to locate victims and obtain their impact information. This may necessitate contacting outside sources such as the Postal Service, driver's license bureau, voter registration agency, Social Security Administration, and utility companies (Godwin & Seymour, 1999). With Internet access, it is fairly easy to search for individuals even though one may have a relatively small amount of information to begin with.

In some cases even more extensive victim assessment may be important to victim safety and appropriate supervision of the offender. This is especially true in cases of domestic violence and sexual abuse where victims and offenders may have past relationships and/or ongoing contact. It can be very valuable to have input from the victim about his or her assessment of the offense, the offender, and his or her own needs. Even though victims should not be compelled to participate in assessment processes, constructively soliciting their input can contribute markedly to the effective management of the offender as well as the victim's safety.

Presser and Lowenkamp (1999) also discuss another aspect of assessment that is particularly pertinent with restorative justice services that include victims, such as victim-offender mediation. They contend that such programs should require a unique kind of screening process that evaluates whether or not the offender will cause the victim emotional trauma. Presently, in many programs, the criteria used to select offenders for participation in restorative justice encounters with victims are not victim oriented. The authors feel a victim-centered offender screening tool should be used to protect victims. They assert that an offender screening tool should assess the following areas, among others:

- denial or acceptance of blame
- moral maturity
- psychopathy
- honesty
- motivation
- empathy
- responsivity

Offenders who are likely to be unresponsive because of social, cognitive, and/or psychological traits probably should be screened out of direct contact with victims to prevent further victimization.

With a restorative justice framework, an important issue is meeting the needs of victims. It can be helpful in determining whether or not a program is meeting this goal to assess victims' satisfaction with the services they are receiving and their opportunities for involvement in the probation process.

Program Examples

The Georgia Department of Pardons and Paroles (Atlanta, GA) and the Deschutes County, Oregon Community Justice Agency have procedures and instruments for assessing victim satisfaction.

Suggested Reading

Godwin, T., & Seymour, A. (1999). *Promising victim-related practices and strategies in probation and parole*. Washington, DC: Office for Victims of Crime, U. S. Department of Justice.

Finally, one other type of assessment that probation professionals may need to undertake is community assessment. There are a variety of methods through which this may be accomplished. Informal assessment occurs at every contact with the community, as people drink coffee together, or meet each other in public places. Probation officers can be attuned to the needs expressed in these information ways, as well as their own observations of community conditions. More formal assessments also may be needed. These can include focus groups, individual interviews, and questionnaires. Focus groups bring together a small group of people to have a structured discussion around particular issues. This information is carefully recorded and reviewed for major themes. Individual interviews may be structured or unstructured. Usually, they involved contacting a sample of community representatives who may be selected randomly or purposively for their particular knowledge and interest in the community. Interviews allow for dialogue between the probation officer and community members through which a variety of issues can be explored. Questionnaires can be used with larger groups of community members to collect data on various issues. Questionnaires usually lead to statistical findings, such as ratings of the most important issues confronting the

respondents. However, they do not allow the assessor to probe for explanations and underlying issues that may provide a greater understanding of problems.

Strategy #2: Supervise Probationers in the Neighborhood/School, Not the Office

The “what works” literature underscores the characteristics that make programs effective in reducing recidivism and thus promoting public safety. The first principle is that intensive services that are behavioral in nature should be provided to higher risk offenders. As discussed previously, the greatest effort should be focused on the offenders who are most likely to continue committing crimes. While probationers who present lesser risk cannot be ignored, services should be scaled to increase as the offender’s level of risk increases.

The Reinventing Probation Council (2000b), stresses the importance of supervising offenders where they live, work, and engage in recreational and other activities. Knowing where the offender lives, his or her family, and the environment in which they function are critical to effective supervision. It is also important to the community for probation to be highly visible in a positive way.

Offender-based classification systems that help to target high-risk offenders for supervision should be augmented by place-based classifications that assess the specific crime problems that compromise community and school safety and the quality of life of its residents or students. This means that effective supervision must be active, engaged, and community-centered. Working in the neighborhoods and schools where offenders live and function allows probation professionals to know the local people and institutions and use them appropriately to help offenders connect with prosocial peers, mentors, and others (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000b). Further, “community-centered supervision activities call for the development of supervision strategies that carefully monitor in concert with others the whereabouts and behavior of offenders” (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000b, p. 21).

This implies a two-pronged approach to supervision:

- working with individual probationers to supervise them in such a way as to promote public safety, and
- working with the neighborhood and school to build social controls and resources and to solve problems.

In this section, the discussion will focus on the first of these, effective offender supervision strategies within the community, and developing neighborhood partnerships for problem-solving and resource building will be addressed further in a later section.

Case Planning and Management

Probation supervision may be limited to law enforcement functions: surveillance, monitoring compliance, and imposing sanctions for noncompliance. However, a broader view incorporates case management/planning as a process for achieving a wider range of goals for probation supervision: public safety, accountability, competency development, rehabilitation, punishment, deterrence, restoration of the harm to the individual victim and to the community as victim, and/or other goals that may be individualized by jurisdiction. There are some fundamental principles that form the foundation of successful case management:

- Case management is assertive and pro-active. It involves vigorously delivering services to the probationer in the community rather than passively offering services in an office location. It seeks to identify issues and address them, rather than waiting to react to crises (Healey, 1999).
- Case management includes weighing the risk the juveniles pose, the needs they exhibit, and the strengths they can access to design and implement a plan to achieve the goals of probation supervision. Inherent in this process is the effective use of assessment and classification techniques and instruments and the acquisition of needed services (Carey, Goff, Hinzman, Neff, Owens, and Albert, 2000).
- Case management is community focused in that the goals and objectives of the probationer's supervision are viewed through the lens of the community, both the community as a whole and the youth's role in the community. This includes involving the community in the case management, setting supervision goals that offer benefit to the community, accessing resources in the community, inviting the community's assistance in achieving the juvenile's supervision goals, and, ultimately, restoring the probationer to a status as a successful community member.
- Case management is diverse in that it matches the specific needs of the individual probationer and flexible in that it can be altered to accommodate newly acquired information from or about a probationer. Case management is not a static but a dynamic process that evolves over the term of a probationer's supervision (Carey, et al, 2000).

Case management begins at the youth's initial point of contact with probation services and continues through exit from the system. In a strong case management system, whenever an

officer has authority over or contact with an youth, either conducting pre- or post-sentencing duties, case management tasks are in process. Initial efforts focus on assessment, orientation, providing information, and evaluating for crisis intervention. Subsequent efforts focus on matching resources to needs, monitoring compliance, and implementing a system of sanctions and rewards to move the client toward successful conclusion of probation supervision and to a role of contributor to society.

Whether conducting pre- or post-adjudication supervision, the case manager determines the type and level of contact with the juvenile that will be needed to achieve supervision goals. In the juvenile justice system, a guiding principle is to intervene at the least restrictive level that will accomplish the desired behavior change. Therefore, a full range of interventions should be available at all points in the system, intake to aftercare, with the goal of assisting the youth to change behavior and prevent entry into the system (through diversion) or prevent the youth from progressing further in the system.

Depending on the assessment of risk, needs, and strengths, the youth may be assigned to a specialized caseload and/or to a particular level of supervision that delineates the frequency of reporting. Requirements for reporting vary from minimal (perhaps not even being required to perform face-to-face reporting) to intensive, which might include day reporting.

A specific tool for the implementation of case management is the individualized case plan. To be functional and practical, case plans should specify in detail and in writing the goals and objectives for the probationer's supervision and should provide both methods and a timetable for supervision activities. The plan should be meaningful to both the probation officer and the probationer, and to his or her parent or guardian, and it must be administratively useful and measurable so its effectiveness in achieving the desired outcomes can be evaluated (Carey, et al, 2000).

Both sanctions and incentives are useful tools in assisting the probationer to comply with the supervision plan, and in order to increase their utility, the probation officer needs to consider the following factors for each. Both sanctions and incentives should be graduated, increasing in intensity with each application. Both should be delivered as soon as possible after the precipitating event, and the imposition of each should occur with a certainty the juvenile can readily rely upon. Psychological theory suggests that in order to most effectively change behavior, incentives should be delivered in a ratio of four to one sanction (Andrews, et al., 1990).

In providing case management services, the probation officer serves as resource broker, and as such must be familiar with resources available in the community. However, the pro-active stance of case management places the probation officer in the position of not just accessing community resources but working with the community to develop resources. The probation officer and agency are also responsible to the community for maintaining a quality of supervision and intervention with juveniles that has the greatest likelihood of meeting community needs.

The probation officer may also serve as an advocate for the youth. This advocacy might include testifying or making recommendations in court on the client's behalf, negotiating pro bono services for clients, or securing priority placements at programs with waiting lists. It could also include mediating difficult situations for the youth (Healy, 1999).

A case management model of supervising juveniles presumes the availability of a full array of services for high-risk/high-need juveniles, adequate intermediate intervention strategies for low-risk/low-need juveniles, and a reliable system for determining risk and need of each youth. In that way resources can be matched to youth needs, and some services previously provided to all juveniles can be reserved for those who have greater need for them. To better apportion and distribute the available resources, probation agencies have begun to look at systems other than one-on-one, face-to-face reporting for service delivery. Group supervision offers some alternatives for both "highs" and "lows" receiving probation services. As opposed to setting standards for number of contacts with the probationer (for example, once per week or once per month), probationers can be seen in groups for services ranging from pre-employment skills classes to intensive cognitive restructuring.

Some jurisdictions have implemented school-based probation, a model in which the probation officer works directly in the school rather than from the probation office. An evaluation of Pennsylvania's school-based initiative concluded that youth placed on school-based probation spent significantly more time in the community without further charges and/or placement as compared to

Program Examples
Community Intensive Supervision Project Pittsburgh, PA 15213
Sixth Judicial District Correctional Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
Dakota County Community Corrections Hastings, MN 55033
Ohio Department of Youth Services Columbus, Ohio 43215-3098

similar youth on regular probation supervision (Kurlychek, Torbet, and Bozynski, 1999).

Toch (1995) describes case management as the hub of a service-delivery wheel. The spokes in the wheel represent the resources supplied to keep the youth functioning at a reasonable level, and missing spokes represent services needed by the youth but not provided. Where services are needed by juveniles but not provided, spokes would be missing, and we can get oddly shaped wheels whose capacity to rotate would be correspondingly diminished.

Cognitive/Behavioral Programming

Cognitive therapy focuses on the ways people think and the content of their thoughts. “Cog probation” (Carey, 1997) applies the cognitive therapy principles to interventions with offenders to achieve the goals of reduced recidivism, offender rehabilitation, and public safety. Cognitive therapy fundamentals for working with juveniles include developing and/or enhancing skills in social adaptation including the following (Lester and Van Voorhis, 2000, p.179):

- self-control,
- an ability to take the perspective of others (empathy),
- problem solving,
- formulating short-term and long-term plans,
- avoiding high-risk situations,
- anticipating the consequences of one’s behavior,
- decision making,
- coping, and
- developing mature thinking strategies.

Youths often have deficits in one or more of these skills and as a result do not respond in a pro-social manner, even if facing punishment. In some cases these deficits may be manifested as “thinking errors” as identified by Yochelson and Samenow (1976) and Samenow (1984, 1989) and summarized by Lester and Van Voorhis (2000 p 173-174) as follows:

- They blame others for their criminal behavior, maintaining, for example, that they “couldn’t help it,” or that “someone else made them do it.”
- They develop an “I can’t” attitude toward their own responsibilities.
- They often fail to understand the concept of injury to others.
- They fail to empathize or put themselves in the place of another person, particularly their victims.

- They fail to put forward enough effort to accomplish necessary goals. Sometimes, they seem not to know how much effort is enough.
- They refuse to accept responsibility.
- They assume an attitude of ownership or entitlement to the property of others, treating others' property as if it already belonged to them.
- They do not appear to understand what constitutes trustworthy behavior.
- They often expect others to "fall into line" to accommodate their own wishes.
- They make decisions irresponsibly by not gathering enough facts, making assumptions, and blaming others.
- Pride is more important than acknowledging their mistakes, or allowing others to get a point across.
- They demonstrate a flawed definition of success and the time it takes to succeed; believing, for example, that they should be a success overnight.
- Many youths cannot seem to accept criticism.
- They deny their own fear and fail to recognize that fear can be constructive.
- They use anger to control others and fail to acknowledge their anger in appropriate ways.
- They overzealously attempt to obtain power, demonstrating "power thrusts" in inappropriate ways.

While cognitive therapy should be delivered by trained therapists, it is possible and desirable to train community corrections professionals for delivery of cognitive instruction in an educational framework to appropriate juveniles. The curricula is delivered to groups through the use of presentations, exercises, group discussion, and work assignments. If therapeutic issues are identified, then referral to a counselor is appropriate. Cognitive instruction delivered by probation personnel does not seek to identify and resolve therapeutic issues, but to provide education (Carey, 1997).

Andrews, et al, (1989, as cited by Carey, 1997) identified more than 500 recent and validated studies that show cognitive/behavioral interventions reduce recidivism by an average of 15%. Carey (1997) also notes that when offenders are properly targeted and matched to the appropriate cognitive and/or behavioral program, recidivism is reduced by an average of 25% to 50%, as compared to control groups. However, it is important to not view cognitive/behavioral intervention as the fits-all answer for every youth. Surveillance, monitoring, mental and chemical health referrals, educational enhancements, family support and counseling, and punishment are also necessary tools, and the optimum approach is to match the intervention to the needs of the individual youth. Offenders who are most likely to benefit

from probation officer-provided, cognitive/behavioral intervention are those who present moderate to high risk of recidivism. Low-risk juveniles are not considered appropriate as they are not likely to return to court regardless of what intervention is imposed, and intervention may actually increase the likelihood of re-offending. It is also prudent to reserve agency resources for those most likely to receive benefit from the services. juveniles with significant cognitive impairment are also inappropriate for cognitive intervention programs (Carey, 1997). In determining a juvenile's suitability for cognitive intervention, Carey (1997 p. 31) suggests asking the following questions:

- Which youths are the highest risk to re-offend?
- What criminogenic factors are present in the juvenile?
- What kind of programming is the youth most appropriate for?
- What type of learning style would produce the best results?
- What type of facilitator or counselor would work best for this youth?
- What other factors might interfere with learning (such as head injury, depression, learning disability, etc.)?

Cognitive approaches can be generally described as one of the following (Carey, 1997):

- *Cognitive restructuring* is used for the juvenile with the most severe anti-social attitudes and behaviors. The intervention assists the youth in examining attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts that are distorted, irrational, or inappropriate. The goal is to change the content of the youth's reasoning.
- *Cognitive skill development* addresses the juvenile's thought processes, identifies areas for skill development, such as anger management, problem solving, assertiveness, or conflict resolution, and aids them in developing the needed skills. The goal is to change the structure of the youth's reasoning.
- *Life skill enhancement* is useful for the juvenile who has limited skills in carrying out essential life tasks, such as securing employment, managing money, maintaining appropriate housing, or establishing appropriate personal relationships. The goal is to increase competencies which will lead to success in society.

Because of the correlation between cognition and behavior, interventions designed to modify behavior are an integral part of a cognitive programming construct and can be used with any of the above three levels. The use of sanctions and incentives within each level can support the tasks being required of the juveniles, such as the preparation of journals, participating in role plays, and participating in group discussions (Carey, 1997).

Moral education is also closely correlated with cognitive skills. As humans develop, there is a progression from concrete reasoning where issues are viewed from a single perspective with yes or no answers to the ability to conduct abstract reasoning and see issues from multiple perspectives. Addressing youths' moral development can be accomplished in conjunction with or separate from cognitive interventions. It is useful to look upon the development of a belief system about what is "right" as a task of cognitive development and to address it as a reasoning skill that can be developed or enhanced. Thus, youths can be assessed to determine the stage of their moral development and can be provided moral education programs in cognitive restructuring, cognitive skills, and life skills groups to assist them in advancing to a higher level of moral reasoning (Lester and Van Voorhis, 2000).

While the same cognitive-behavioral intervention and moral educational strategies can be used with adolescents, the adolescents' developmental stages must be considered and addressed in the programming. For instance, the adolescents' more intense emotional state and their reduced impulse control present the need for greater emphasis on developing skills in these areas. Programming for adolescents should include the use of life examples that are age-appropriate, and facilitators should be cognizant that adolescents may not be capable of working on higher-order skills. (D. Swanson, personal communication, August 2000).

Prochaska, Norcross, and DiClemente (1994) provide information about the stages individuals pass through during the process of changing that can be helpful both to assess the level of cognitive intervention that should be initiated and to track a juvenile's progress toward completing the needed behavior change. They identify the stages of change as pre-contemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, maintenance, and termination, and they recognize relapse as an expected and critical part of the change process. Understanding the change process and the tactics employed to resist change can assist the probation officer in developing realistic expectations and goals for each youth.

An agency wishing to implement cognitive curricula, particularly with existing staff, should be prepared to (Carey, 1997):

- provide appropriate staff training,
- address agency standards for personal and collateral contacts to facilitate "group" contacts,
- assess how new duties required of officers will be evaluated,

Program Examples:

- address job classification and union issues that may arise,
- provide staff with a source of consultation services to discuss difficult situations they are facing in their groups,
- establish a system for quality control, and
- support and encourage staff, recognizing that some staff may not be able to conduct groups.

Adult and Adolescent Day Alternative
Services Program
Rochester, MN 55904

Dakota County Community Corrections
Hastings, MN 55033

Ohio Division of Youth Services

Specialized/Intensive Supervision Caseloads

In recent years, there has been a proliferation of practices that provide special or intensive supervision for particular subsets of juveniles. These specialized caseloads are usually designated in one of two ways:

- by the characteristics of the juvenile offenders (e.g., sex offenders, severely emotionally disabled or developmentally disabled offenders, substance abusers, gang members), or
- by the type of supervision given, presumably to a wider variety of youth who have high risk characteristics (e.g., intensive supervision).

As shown in the first part of this paper, 38 states report having some type of specialized caseloads for juvenile probation, and 43 states report having intensive supervision caseloads.

The concept of specialized supervision in probation is not an uncontested issue. Those who favor specialized caseloads argue that probation officers who work with one type of juvenile gain expertise regarding the types of problems presented by them and the kinds of supervision and treatment services they need. Caseload sizes usually are reduced in these specialized units, and therefore, probation officers have more time to provide intensive and individualized services the youth need. On the other hand, those who maintain generalized caseloads are preferable often cite as drawbacks the higher cost of special caseloads and the difficulty in recruiting or training probation officers with sufficient expertise about the particular needs of the targeted juvenile offender group (Latessa, Parks, Allen & Carlson, 1979).

While specialized caseloads are feasible in urban areas where there are higher numbers of probationers, they often are not possible in rural areas. There may not be a sufficient number of offenders with specific problems or types of offenses to comprise a specialized caseload. Rural areas also present problems related to travel distances, and it may be most practical to assign officers cases geographically rather than based on other classifications.

Given the findings of the “what works” research, it appears that effective probation practice should be scaled to match the assessed risks and needs of different offenders. Therefore, some type of specialized caseloads provided with more intensive supervision appear to be desirable if there are sufficient numbers of youth to make them practical. Whether these should be mixed groups of high risk offenders or specialized groups based on particular characteristics has not been fully researched. Much may depend on the resources available in a given agency and the number of youth who might have certain characteristics.

The following discussion focuses on the use of intensive supervision caseloads and could be applied to other types of specialized caseloads (e.g., sex offender, substance abusing, gang involved) as well. The fact that many offenders have more than one high risk characteristic (e.g., sex offender and substance abuse, or gang members with substance abuse issues) means that even if specialized caseloads are formed, probation professionals will need to be knowledgeable about a variety of offender problems and supervision methods.

Krisberg et al. (1994) define juvenile intensive supervision programs as “postadjudication, nonresidential programs for serious juvenile offenders as an alternative to long-term institutional placement” (p. 2). They base their model of intensive supervision programs on the rationale that high-risk juveniles can be managed safely and effectively in the community. They list five key elements of a juvenile intensive supervision program:

1. **Program context.** The model stems from a philosophy of risk control including both incapacitation and rehabilitation approaches.
2. **Client identification.** The population of juveniles advocated in this model are those who otherwise might be placed in correctional facilities due to the seriousness of their offenses or their risk of continuing delinquent behavior.
3. **Intervention strategy.** Highly structured supervision and a broad array of treatment alternatives are the hallmarks of this model. Control, case planning and management, core service requirements, and a system of rewards and graduated sanctions are the strategies used. The model proposes five program phases:

- short-term residential placement or incarceration,
- day treatment,
- outreach and tracking,
- routine supervision, and
- discharge from supervision.

4. **Contextual and implementation issues.** Intensive supervision programs should have a broad base of community support and be used in conjunction with other community resources, requiring coordination of multiple agencies' efforts.

5. **Goals and evaluation.** If used as an alternative to residential placements, the program will be cost effective.

As mentioned above, the intervention strategy consists of five phases. The first phase, residential or institutional placement usually last 15 to 45 days and is intended to stabilize the youth's behavior, provide them with an orientation of the program's rules and expectations, and allow time for a detailed assessment and case plan to be completed (Krisberg, et al., 1994).

Phase two involves the youth in day treatment which is a full time program of educational and other services which lasts four to six months. Programming includes daytime activities, house arrest and strict curfews, including the following specific components (Krisberg, et al., 1994):

- educational, vocational, and social skill development;
 - linking youth with appropriate persons and organizations in the community;
 - referrals for special needs, such as substance abuse or mental health counseling;
 - working with parents to improve their influence and control of the youth;
 - making preparations for phase three when the youth will be involved in traditional school or other settings;
 - performing community service and/or paying restitution;
 - participating in evening and weekend recreational and cultural activities; and
 - receiving appropriate rewards and sanctions.
- Phase three is the outreach and tracking component of the program. Youth are intensively monitored, and probation workers meet with family members, employers, and teachers. Rehabilitation efforts begun during phase two are continued as needed in this phase. Rehabilitation programming should include (Krisberg, et al., 1994):
- involvement with mentors and other positive role models;
 - participation in community organizations that provide recreational, cultural, or supplementary educational experiences;

- participation in group counseling;
- continuation in programs that address special needs, such as substance abuse or mental health problems;
- involvement with parents to strengthen parenting skills; and
- provision of rewards and sanctions for appropriate and inappropriate behavior.

During phase four the youth moves to regular probation supervision without the extensive monitoring and programming provided previously. This is a period of transition to termination of supervision. This is usually a two to three month program. Services for special needs (e.g., substance abuse) may continue during the phase, and the case worker maintains contact with the family (Krisberg, et al., 1994).

Program Examples

“Operation Night Light” in Boston

Dodge/Fillmore/Olmsted Counties
Community Corrections Department
Rochester, MN

“New Chance Program” of Dakota County,
MN Community Corrections Department

Breaking the Cycle (funded through the National Institute of Justice) is a system-wide, coordinated program designed to reduce substance abuse and delinquent activity of drug-involved youth by combining drug treatment with juvenile justice sanctions and incentives. The only juvenile program is located at Lane County, Oregon Department of Youth Services

Phase five is discharge and follow up. When the youth has completed the goals of the case plan, he or she is discharged. However, some services may remain in place, such as contact with a positive mentor (Krisberg, et al., 1994).

School-Based Probation

A good example of supervising juvenile probationers in the context of their daily lives is the practice of school-probation partnerships.

For several years, the Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission and the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency have supported school-based probation programs in most of Pennsylvania’s counties. Juvenile probation officers have offices at the schools where they meet with students on their caseloads, follow up on any school behavior problems, and conduct home visits and other duties while maintaining a base at the school (Gardner, 1994; Griffin, 1999).

A similar program is operating in Fresno, California and combines the efforts of the school district, police department and probation department. Police-probation-school resource officer teams work in seven high schools. Juvenile probationers at the schools are supervised by the team probation officer. Other activities include diversion programs and informal hearings to deal with minor offenses of youth in the school (Hamilton, 1996).

These programs have noted improvements in campus safety and decreases in violent crime at the schools. Probationers have experienced fewer school detentions, suspensions, tardiness, and absenteeism as well. Proponents of school-based probation also believe at-risk youth also may benefit from having probation officers in the school (Gardner, 1994; Griffin, 1999; Hamilton, 1996).

Program Example:
Lehigh County, Pennsylvania School-Based Probation Program
Fresno County, California Probation Department

Neighborhood-Based Supervision

Supervising probationers where they live, rather than from an office setting is a mainstay of the Reinventing Probation Council's (2000b) recommended strategies. As an example of such an approach they provided the following.

. . . [M]eaningful and effective neighborhood-based supervision must be conducted at times that are not confined to the traditional 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, workday. To be effective, it must be delivered at nights, on weekends, and on holidays. . . .

In addition to nontraditional work hours, the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department has created a “virtual office” out of its South Port site. The adult probation officers share the building with juvenile probation officers. When in the field the officers are equipped with cell phones and laptop computers where they can plug into the office to receive e-mail, print documents or enter data. They work where their work is located, namely, in the community. In fact, without the traditional office setting, the officers must conduct their work in different community-based locations, seeking out offenders, local residents and others. This approach, if successful, will be expanded throughout the department.

The Juvenile Probation Department in Maricopa County under the Superior Court in Arizona implemented “Virtual Office Probation Officers” as well to increase the officers’ productive time in the community and to rationally allocate the department’s resources. These officers only spend one day a week in a traditional office setting. Their virtual office is a briefcase on wheels that carries their laptop computer, cellular phone, and other support materials. The department’s Juvenile On-Line Tracking System has been transformed into field book application. The results of drug tests, restitution payments, compliance with other conditions of probation, safety alerts and scheduled court hearings are kept up to date and transmitted to the field book for use by the officer and/or by the court. The probation staff also work as teams to establish collegial groups within the community, allowing juvenile probation officers to develop relationships with businesses, schools, and community organizations within specific neighborhood areas. The project has increased meaningful interaction with juvenile offenders and their families and enhanced the quality of information provided to the court.

Source: Reinventing Probation Council. (2000b).
*Transforming Probation Through Leadership:
The “Broken Windows” Model.*
New York: Center for Civic Innovation.
Pages 21-22

For further information, contact:

Chief Probation Officer
Maricopa County Adult Probation Department
111 S. Third Ave., 3rd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
(602) 506-7244

Cheryl K. Townsend
Chief Probation Officer
Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department
5332 N. 6th St.
Phoenix, AZ 85012-140
(602) 506-4210

Electronic Supervision Tools. Increasingly sophisticated technology is making the close surveillance of high-risk youth in the community easier and more affordable. While it is impractical to have probation officers constantly watching juveniles, with electronic supervision tools, heightened surveillance is possible at a fraction of the cost of human observation, thus,

theoretically, freeing probation officers to attend more to the youth's rehabilitation needs while maintaining public safety.

There are several types of electronic supervision tools, and these are being enhanced at a rapid pace. Four basic types of electronic supervision tools presently are available:

- *Continuously signaling devices* use a transmitter attached to the youth (usually around the wrist or ankle) that emits a continuous radio signal. A receiver in the juvenile's home detects the signals from the transmitter and sends them over the telephone lines to a monitoring computer. The computer receives the signal when the offender is present in the home and records the loss of the signal when the offender leaves. These changes are compared to a predetermined schedule of when the offender is to be at home or out of the home. Alerts are sent to probation officers when the offender's actual presence at home differs from his or her approved schedule (Schmidt, 1991).
- *Programmed contact devices* can be set to call the youth at intervals to verify whether he or she is at a required location. The calls can be random or scheduled. There are several ways to verify that the juvenile is actually the person responding to the call. Some systems use voice verification that can match the voice of the person speaking to a voice sample taken earlier. Other systems have the offender wear a small device on the arm that can be inserted into a verifier box connected to the telephone. Visual verification, through the use of camera technology also can be used to ensure that the youth is actually responding to the call. When the juvenile does not answer the call or his or her identity cannot be verified, the probation officer can be alerted (Schmidt, 1991).
- *Global Positioning Satellite* is a relatively new development. The offender wears a transmitter that communicates signals to a satellite and back to a computer monitor. This system has the capability of locating the individual at any place and recording his or her whereabouts. Zones can be designated where the offender is allowed to be and not allowed to be. If the system detects he or she is in a restricted area, an alert is generated. This type of technology may be especially useful for monitoring sex offenders and domestic violence offenders who are prohibited from going to certain locations in the community. It is presently the most expensive system because of the use of satellite time.
- Remote alcohol testing devices can be used with other monitoring systems or alone. They require the offender to blow into a device like a breathalyzer, and the results are transmitted to a computer that records the amount of alcohol, if present. If the offender is prohibited from using alcohol and the equipment detects use, the probation officer can be notified.

These devices can be helpful for several purposes within probation. They can be used to enforce curfews or home confinement imposed as sanctions on youth. They also may be used as a means of public protection or individual victim protection to alert the victim or the probation officer when an offender is approaching an area that may bring him or her in contact with possible victims. Further, they can be used to ensure that probationers are maintaining sobriety as ordered by the court.

Electronic supervision tools should be viewed as just that -- tools. They cannot take the place of other program components. As part of an intensive supervision program, they can assist with surveillance, but the program still must have other accountability and offender rehabilitation components to be effective. In fact, youth may wear the devices like a badge of honor or status symbol, defeating some of the deterrent effect of the restraint.

Electronic supervision tools are not infallible.

They can be tampered with by the youth, there can be interruptions in power or telephone service, or there can be equipment malfunctions for various reasons. Therefore, it is important not to oversell the use of technology either to the corrections field or to

Program Examples
Solano County Juvenile Probation Fairfield, CA
Jefferson County Juvenile Probation Birmingham, AL

the public. Programs using electronic supervision tools are most effective if they have staff available to respond to alerts as quickly as possible after they occur. Staff should regularly check on reports from the monitoring computer and provide appropriate sanctions if youth are not complying with curfews, home detention, or restrictions on where they may go.

Drug and Alcohol Testing. Drug and alcohol testing also are examples of technology that can be employed to assist probation officers in supervising juveniles. Because of the high correlation between substance abuse and delinquency, helping youth remain drug- and alcohol-free can also help them in maintaining appropriate behavior. Drug and alcohol testing can be used as stand-alone conditions of probation, but for youth with substance abuse problems, they should be used in conjunction with substance abuse treatment.

Alcohol can be detected through the use of breath analysis or saliva testing. Both methods are accurate and can indicate whether or not the offender has drunk alcohol recently. Alcohol stays in the body a very short time, so the most effective way of detecting alcohol use is to

employ these devices while doing home visits or at other places in the community where youth will not be expecting to be tested.

Several substances of abuse (marijuana, cocaine, PCP, amphetamine, methamphetamine, opiates, and others) can be tested through urinalysis. Urine testing is presently the most accurate and cost effective method of testing for drugs of abuse. However, several other, less invasive methods of testing are in development and may soon be used more readily. These include hair testing, sweat patches, and saliva testing.

Drug testing should be conducted randomly so youth cannot learn to schedule their substance use to avoid detection. Strict chain of custody procedures must be in place, especially if juveniles will receive potent sanctions for the use of alcohol and other drugs.

Every drug test should be accompanied by a response -- graduated incentives (e.g., praise, encouragement, rewards) for negative test results, and graduated sanctions (e.g., reprimands, warnings, restrictions, and possibly revocation) for positive results. If the youth is participating in a substance abuse

Program Examples
Colorado Division of Youth Corrections
Lane County Department of Youth Services
South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice

treatment program, it is crucial that probation officers and treatment providers work cooperatively to determine the best approaches to take if the youth continues to use psychoactive substances.

Day Treatment Programs. Day treatment programs are used for juveniles who require more supervision than can be provided through other forms of probation. However, they are still able to live at home. The day treatment programs provide supervision for all or part of the youth's day, and he or she is involved in programming that assists with issues such as school problems, peer influences, family problems, and work difficulties. Services provided may include individual counseling, group sessions, academic help, and prosocial activities. Usually there is a family component to the program to help with parenting skills and the youth's adjustment at home.

As with other intensive supervision strategies, day treatment may actually increase the likelihood that youth will be found violating probation conditions or committing new offenses.

The extent of supervision contact with youth is so much greater than less intensive methods of supervision, that the probability of learning about violations or new offenses is increased.

Specialized Courts

During the past few years specialized courts have proliferated across the country. Juvenile or family courts have long been a mainstay of American jurisprudence. Although these courts initially were started to recognize the special rehabilitative needs of children and to separate them from the busier and more formal adult courts, in many places they have become just as overburdened as the criminal courts system.

However, innovators have recently taken the idea of specialized courts a step further. Drug courts were one of the earlier developments, and therefore, are more fully developed and have spread further than some others. In addition to drug courts, several other specialized courts have developed including:

- domestic violence courts,
- gun courts,
- gang courts,
- mental health courts, and
- youth courts

While each of these courts has different offender populations and crime problems with which they are dealing, their general philosophy and purposes are similar. This discussion is based on literature on drug courts, but in most cases, the issues are similar.

Drug courts combine intensive supervision from a judge with mandatory sanctions and treatment to help offenders break the cycles of addiction and crime. They also emphasize collaboration among all parts of the justice system and treatment providers. The involvement of probation professionals in the drug courts across the country has been uneven, but the kind of oversight and treatment advocated by drug courts is consistent with intensive supervision and offender rehabilitation strategies.

The National Association of Drug Court Professionals (1997) has developed the following key components of drug courts. Most of these could be modified to fit specialized courts for other populations as well.

- Integrate treatment services with justice system case processing.

- Use a nonadversarial approach; both the prosecution and defense counsel should promote public safety while protecting participants' due process rights.
- Identify eligible participants early and promptly place them in the drug court program.
- Provide offenders with access to a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services.
- Monitor abstinence by frequent alcohol and other drug testing.
- A coordinated strategy is used to respond to participants' compliance.
- Ongoing judicial interaction with each drug court participant is essential.
- Achievement of program goals is measured, and program effectiveness is monitored and evaluated.
- Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations.
- Partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generate local support and enhance drug court effectiveness.

Program Examples
Maricopa County, Arizona Juvenile Drug Court
Utah Administrative Office of the Courts Drug Court
Escambia County Juvenile Drug Court Pensacola, FL 32501

Youth courts (also called teen courts and peer courts) have become a prevalent adjunct to the juvenile justice system. They may operate under the auspice of a juvenile justice agency or other educational or community agencies. Youth are involved as volunteers to hold their peers accountable for some offenses. There are several models of youth courts that are effective. For more information see the Web site www.youthcourt.net.

Strategy #3: Rationally Allocate Resources

The third strategy outlined by the Reinventing Probation Council (2000b) stresses the interdependence between the allocation of resources and the provision of meaningful, neighborhood-centered supervision. This concept of supervision, coupled with sufficient staff and other resources, focuses attention on offenders who are most at risk of posing a public safety risk. Rationally allocating resources involves accurate knowledge of juveniles and the rational assignment of field staff to community areas where those youth present the greatest risk to public safety.

At least four types of resources must be considered:

- funding,
- personnel,
- job-related tools (e.g., computers, telephones, office space, vehicles),
- information, and
- other justice system resources.

Funding

The variety of funding sources for probation (i.e, state, local, offender fees) was presented in the first section of this paper. Probation is a field with limited financial resources. Juvenile justice funding includes prevention, law enforcement, juvenile courts, and juvenile corrections.

Within juvenile corrections, juvenile institutions receive disproportionately larger amounts of funding when compared to the limited number of youth they serve. Although comprehensive data on juvenile justice costs are not available, one study shows the disparity between juvenile institutions and probation. The Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council published a report in 1997 entitled, *Apples to Apples: Comparing the Operational Costs of Juvenile and Adult Correctional Programs in Texas*. Their assessment found that during 1995-96, the most costly criminal justice program in the state was juvenile incarceration. The daily cost per juvenile held in a Texas Youth Commission facility was \$113.44, and the daily cost for juvenile probation/deferred prosecution was \$8.21. In other words, providing juvenile probation services for a youth cost the state roughly seven percent of the cost of incarcerating a youth.

The following excerpt from the recent publication, *Less Hype, More Help: Reducing Juvenile Crime, What Works -- and What Doesn't* by Richard A. Mendel (2000) provides a description of the information available (and not available) nationally about the cost of juvenile justice, and it provides a summary of known costs with the caveat that they are likely an underestimation of actual expenditures.

What Does America Spend for Juvenile Justice?

How much does American spend every year on juvenile justice and delinquency prevention? Good question. Unfortunately, one without a good answer. The federal Bureau of Justice Statistics maintains a complete annual data set on all criminal justice expenditures nationwide -- law enforcement, courts, and corrections. Yet the data are only for adult courts and corrections. No data are compiled for juvenile justice expenditures. In 1988, the Bureau of Justice Statistics produce a one-time estimate, placing the national spending to arrest, prosecute and detain juvenile offenders at \$15 to \$20 billion per year, including \$2 billion per year to detain juvenile offenders. However, that analysis has not been repeated since 1988.

Likewise, many states do not maintain data even on total state spending for juvenile justice activities -- never mind expenditures by local governments to support municipal and county courts, detention centers, and probation agencies. Thus, a reliable national estimate of national expenditures for juvenile justice does not now exist. In October 1999, the National Association of State Budget Officers released the results of a national survey, *State Juvenile Justice Expenditures and Innovations*, updating a similar survey conducted in 1994. The survey calculated state, local and federal expenditures for residential placement, community programming, delinquency prevention and post-residential care, and identified a total of \$4.22 billion in 1998 -- up 65 percent from the \$2.55 billion identified in 1994. This figure grossly understates actual spending, however. NASBO was unable to collect data from three states -- Connecticut, Delaware, and Alaska -- and omitted them entirely. Second, the estimates seriously undercounted state-level juvenile justice spending in several states. In Illinois, NASBO estimated total juvenile justice expenditures of \$90,915 in 1998 -- though state expenditures for juvenile corrections alone were \$81 million dollars. The survey counted only \$84 million for Maryland and \$402 million for Florida in 1998, when official state budgets for juvenile justice in these states were \$124 million and \$512 million respectively.

Because NASBO surveyed only state-level agencies, its survey counted local juvenile justice spending only when it was part of a state match. As a result, NASBO identified only \$351 million in local juvenile justice expenditures, even though localities are primarily responsible in most states for financing and operating juvenile courts, probation, pre-trial detention, and community-based programming for juvenile offenders. Just in California's 15 largest counties alone, local juvenile justice expenditures consumed \$344 million in 1993-94. In Washington State, NASBO identified less than \$600,000 in local juvenile justice expenditures, while the Washington State Institute for Public Policy calculated the cost of operating juvenile courts, probation operations and detention centers at \$71.6 million in 1995.

So how much does America spend on juvenile justice? Unfortunately, the answer remains a mystery. However, from the data that are available it is clear that the figure for juvenile courts and corrections (not including primary prevention) exceeds \$10 billion and may approach \$15 billion per year. Despite the significant drop in juvenile crime since 1993, the figure continues to grow rapidly -- threatening to eclipse budgets for other youth development activities such as after school programming, school-to-career programs, and youth employment.

Personnel

The National Center for Juvenile Justice estimates there are 18,000 juvenile probation professionals in the United States. Of these, 85 percent provide direct services to youth, including intake, investigations, and supervision, while 15 percent are involved in administration and management. The report also says, "Generally, juvenile probation officers are college-educated white males, 30-49 years old, with 5 - 10 years of experience in the field" (Torbet, 1996, p. 1).

Beginning salaries of juvenile probation officers vary considerably across the country. The lowest starting salaries are \$20,000 or less in Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Oregon, and West Virginia, and the highest starting salaries are \$40,000 or more in Connecticut (American Correctional Association, 1998).

There also is considerable variation among states as to the minimum education requirements for juvenile probation officers. Thirty-six states have minimum requirements, while the other 13 vary by county or local jurisdictions. Of these 36 states, the following minimum education requirements are in place (American Correctional Association, 1998):

- High school -- 5 states
- BA or experience -- 1 state
- BA degree -- 20 states
- BA plus experience -- 8 states
- BA plus a test -- 1 state
- BA/MA -- 1 state

Mandatory training for juvenile probation officers also varies markedly from state to state. In some cases, there are differences between the number of hours required during the first year and those required after the first year of employment. During the first year, mandated training hours required range from 20 in Connecticut and Rhode Island to 200 in California for the 35 states that have requirements. Seventeen of these states require 40 hours of training. The median is 40 hours, and the mean hours of training required is 63. Training requirements after the first year of employment range from 10 hours per year in North Carolina to 60 hours per year in New Hampshire. Twenty-three states mandate 40 hours (which is also the median number of hours required), and the mean number of hours required is 36 (American Correctional Association, 1998).

Caseload per officer is another mechanism for looking at the issue of probation resources. Torbet (1996) reported that juvenile probation caseloads ranged from two to more than 200

with a typical (median) active caseload of 41. However, probation officers responding to the National Center for Juvenile Justice's survey felt that a caseload of 30 youth was optimal. Juvenile probation caseload sizes vary by types of jurisdictions. Median caseloads for officers in urban areas was 47, in suburban areas 40, and in rural areas 30. Several variables can affect caseload sizes. The upper age limits for juvenile court jurisdiction varies according to state laws. Three states have an upper age limit of 15; ten states have set the upper age limit at 16; and 37 have age 17 as the upper age limit (Snyder & Sickmund, 1995). Juvenile offending is more common among older youth. Therefore, in states where the upper age limit for juvenile court jurisdiction is lower, there likely will be proportionately fewer juvenile cases on probation. As discussed in an earlier section of this paper, juvenile probation duties vary considerably among states. Some have responsibility for juvenile detention and various family court functions as well as community supervision of both delinquent and status offending youth, while in other states, duties of juvenile probation are limited to supervision tasks. All of these factors and more affect caseload sizes (Torbet, 1996).

Caseload sizes alone can be misleading as an indicator of the equitable distribution of work among juvenile probation personnel or as a measure of an appropriate level of supervision of youth. Looking at personnel issues in terms of absolute caseload sizes is faulty. Workload measures are a much more realistic approach to take because they consider the number of cases, contacts and other responsibilities for each case, and other job responsibilities that are not related to specific case management. As the American Probation and Parole Association's Issue Paper on Caseload Standards states:

. . . [C]ases (probationers/parolees) will be treated differently in terms of the amount and type of supervision they will receive. This means that the caseload officer will be expected to give differing amounts of time and types of attention to different cases.

In practice, this translates into different types of frequencies of personal contacts for the caseload officer. Generally speaking, the more serious or higher priority cases are assigned a greater level of supervision, meaning that the officer will be expected to have more frequent contact with that offender (and others involved in the case). More frequent contact results in more time being spent on a higher priority case. The converse is also true, that lower priority cases demand less time of the caseload officer.

It thus becomes clear that in counting cases under this approach, it is necessary to factor in the priority of the case, as that will determine the amount of time the officer is required to spend. Cases cannot be counted as equal, because they are being assigned differing priorities, and are requiring differing amounts of caseload officer time.

Therefore, instead of setting a caseload standard, APPA encourages the use of workload measures. There are several ways to determine workloads. One method involves weighting caseloads by identifying the events that occur in a particular type of case, documenting the frequency of these events, and recording how much time each event requires. This makes case assessment and classification especially important, so youth can be grouped according to their risks and/or needs, and time for supervision can be allotted accordingly. Other methods of determining workload standards can include sampling expert opinions and comparing juvenile probation workloads with those of similar jurisdictions (Hurst, 1999).

The APPA Issue Paper continues by saying:

. . . .[T]he workload model is based on differentiation among cases. It bases that on the amount of time required to supervise a particular case up to standards. Since cases are assigned to different levels of supervision, they will require varying amounts of time for the officer to supervise up to standards. The workload concept factors time into the weight that a case receives in assigning it to an officer and for accounting for its contribution to the officer's total responsibilities.

Under a workload approach, individual supervision cases are not all equal. Some are worth more because they have greater requirements for the type and frequency of contact required. Others are worth less, because less is required.

The entire APPA Issues Paper on Caseload Standards can be found at www.appa-net.org. As of February 1, 1998, 11 states used workload formulas for juvenile probation (American Correctional Association, 1998).

Another personnel resource that sometimes is overlooked in probation services is the use of volunteers. Many agencies use volunteers very successfully in a variety of capacities, and their services free the time of probation professionals to use their expertise

Program Example

Dakota County, Minnesota Community Corrections Department hires a full time coordinator for volunteers.

more productively. There are a variety of roles volunteers may play within an agency. Many can assist with routine tasks, such as paperwork, filing, and making telephone calls. Others may be able to work directly with youth as mentors or in literacy and employment training programs. Still others may serve on boards such as the Reparative Boards in Vermont that provide a community-based accountability structure for offenders. Volunteers may also serve in advisory roles to administrators or line personnel. This is particularly important as probation strives to become more community oriented. Key informants from the community -- whether

in formal or informal ways -- will be vital to helping probation understand the community and be accepted by residents. Some volunteers also might be helpful in working with victims of juveniles by keeping them updated on aspects of the case, referring them to needed services, and answering questions about the probation process.

In whatever capacity volunteers are used, it is important that they understand the purpose and responsibilities of probation and their role as a partner with probation. For many types of volunteers just discussed, it will be important to provide training, either formally or informally.

Training should include how to perform their specific duties as well as issues such as confidentiality and communication.

Job-Related Tools

A variety of job-related tools may be helpful to juvenile probation professionals, ranging from basic office equipment to vehicles. Probation is increasingly finding ways to use technology to assist in achieving its goals. For example, in the description of the virtual offices used in Maricopa County, Arizona Juvenile Probation Department, cellular telephones and laptop computers were standard operating equipment.

Some agencies hesitate to spend the money necessary for technology tools, but they may need to look at the situation more broadly. Technological equipment may be expensive, but if it saves staff time or allows staff to do a better job, it can be very cost-effective. For example, if staff are unable to complete necessary paperwork promptly because of limited computer access, it may be costing the agency more in wasted staff time than the additional computers would cost.

Information

<div>American Probation and Parole Association</div> <div>www.appa-net.org</div> <div>Justice Information Center: National Criminal Justice Reference Service www.ncjrs.org/ncjhome.htm</div> <div>Departments of Corrections Directory www.tiac.net/users/leprecon/blue.html</div> <div>National Archive of Criminal Justice Data www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/home.html</div> <div>National Association of Probation Executives www.shsu.edu/cjcenter/CMIT/nape</div>	<p>Information is one of the most valuable resources any probation professional can have. In this “information age” it is increasingly important to have up-to-date information. This can take two forms. First, probation professionals need information that will enhance their job performance, such as the case management information provided by the computerized case management system used in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The more probation officers can understand the specific problems presented by their probationers and have research-based options for intervening with them appropriately, the more likely they are to meet probation’s goals of public protection, offender accountability, and offender competency development. Professional books and journals are an important resource, and agencies should budget for the purchase of these, if possible. Where budgets cannot cover such costs, working with local libraries to obtain copies through interlibrary loan will take more time but provide the information. The Internet is increasingly used to obtain information. There is a plethora of information available on multiple justice-related topics. The Federal Government provides many documents online, as do associations and other groups. Many pages have links to other sites that lead to additional information. The box contains some important Web sites that agencies may want to check on a regular bases for general information or related to specific topics.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Second, another type of information that is equally as valuable is that about offenders. It is now possible to integrate information systems to make background information, as well as current status of offenders much more readily acceptable. Having court, probation, law enforcement, and other related systems linked electronically, can cut down on duplication of work (e.g., collecting background information) and increase the speed with which information is available for decision making. For example, in many localities, the court orders youth to pay restitution; the clerk of the court is responsible for actually collecting the money; and probation is charged with monitoring the

Program Examples

Maricopa County, Arizona Juvenile Probation Department has a good integrated information system

youth's payments. When all of these activities are handled separately, it is very difficult to coordinate. However, when the court can enter orders directly into a computer that can be accessed by the clerk and probation, and the clerk can enter payments that are instantly accessible by probation, the system can keep track of how the offender is meeting these obligations much better.

Other Justice System Resources

Probation agencies also have the opportunity, and perhaps the obligation, to wisely use and conserve other juvenile justice system resources. One way in which this can be accomplished is the implementation of graduated sanctions, as suggested by Taxman, Soule, and Gelb (1999). Responding to noncompliant behavior from juveniles through the immediate application of incremental sanctions often can increase compliance and deter further inappropriate behavior. When probation personnel apply graduated sanctions appropriately, they may be able to stop the escalation of the youth's noncompliant behavior to the point where a return to court for revocation proceedings is needed. With already congested dockets, this saves the court's time in handling these cases. Further, if patterns of noncompliance can be handled through the use of graduated incentives and sanctions by probation, the use of more costly juvenile justice resources, such as detention and institutions may be avoided.

Strategy #4: Provide for Strong Enforcement of Probation Conditions and a Quick Response to Violations

Offenders on probation must be held accountable when they fail to comply with conditions of their supervision. Any act of commission or omission that is contrary to the conditions of probation is considered a violation. The violation may result from the offender's commission of a new offense or it may be a technical violation which includes any non-compliance that is not a new offense, including absconding.

The Reinventing Probation Council (2000b) identifies strong enforcement of probation conditions and quick response to violations as a key strategy for holding probationers accountable and establishing probation as a rational system. Too often, offenders have come to expect that they can exhibit two or more instances of non-compliance before action will be taken. The Council advocates enforcement of each and every condition of probation and a timely response to every violation.

While every violation warrants a response, the responses should correspond to the seriousness and frequency of the violation, with incarceration or placement being a final rather

than an initial response except for the most serious violations. Jurisdictions may rely upon the discretion of the probation officer to decide responses or they may establish a structured response system. Structured responses typically involve developing written policy, refining procedures, and expanding the range of sanctions for violations (Parent, Wentworth, Burke, & Ney, 1994).

Structured responses to violations may be implemented to make sanctions more consistent, more equitable, and more proportional to the seriousness of the violation or to make sanctions more certain and more swift. They also can serve the purpose of streamlining case flow and improving operating efficiency (Parent et al., 1994).

Taxman et al. (1999, p. 183) define graduated sanctions as:

. . .structured, incremental responses to noncompliant behavior of probationers while they are under supervision. They are designed to give the probation officer the ability to respond quickly to noncompliant acts through a series of actions such as . . . more drug testing, more reporting, or a curfew. The sanctioning process uses modest steps to restrict the offender's liberty to deter future noncompliant acts and ensure the integrity of the court order. The specific sanction depends on factors such as the nature of the violation and whether it is the first violation. Thus, graduated sanctions provide immediate and certain consequences for defiant behavior.

Graduated sanctions provide a range of responses to violations and a model graduated sanctions system combines treatment and rehabilitation with reasonable, fair, humane, and appropriate sanctions. Community-based graduated sanctions programs appear to be at least as successful as traditional incarceration in reducing recidivism, and the most well-structured graduated sanctions programs appear to be more effective than incarceration (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention [OJJDP], 1995 p.134).

Strategic and appropriate intervention includes accurately correlating the response to the offense so that the offender receives neither too little nor too much intervention. Too often, lack of coherent intervention allows the serious offender to believe no significant response will be forthcoming, or minor offenders receive unneeded, intensive, protracted intervention that puts significant strain on agency resources and reduces the availability of resources for more serious offenders.

Graduated sanctions begin with responses imposed by the individual officer and might be discretionary or require supervisory approval. Initial sanctions might include increased reporting, increased drug testing, refusal to allow travel, or referrals to community resources.

A second level of intervention might involve supervisory personnel for what some agencies call staffing or administrative reprimand. This level of sanction involves the probationer, probation officer, and supervisor having a formal meeting. The meeting is used to discuss the problem behaviors, previously attempted solutions, outcomes, and additional strategies to be applied. The results of the meeting become part of the case record and may be used in subsequent revocation proceedings if the noncompliance continues (Parent et al., 1994).

Program examples:

Enforcement:

Operation Night Light
Dorchester, MA 02124

Graduated sanctions:

Tarrant County Juvenile Probation
Department
Fort Worth, TX 76111-3007

21st Judicial Circuit Court
Clayton, MO 63105

In some cases, the next level of sanctions can be imposed by a hearing officer who has been empowered by the court to hear and make decisions on certain types of cases. Finally, the offender can be returned to court to appear before the judge who could impose the ultimate sanction of revocation and out-of-home placement. The levels of responses are not necessarily imposed sequentially; they are used as appropriate for the level of offense.

Strategy #5: Develop Partners in the Community

Within a community justice framework, the need to establish enduring partnerships with the citizenry, other agencies, and local interest groups is critical to the success of probation. Forming such partnerships increases probation's leverage in dealing with offenders and contributes to a shared co-ownership for managing the risk such offenders present under community supervision. What this demands is that the community be involved in the business of community supervision. In sharp contrast to the trend toward the insulation of the justice system from the community, this shift will require that probation agencies practice inclusiveness by reaching out well beyond the traditional boundaries that currently guide their organization's interactions with others (Hinzman, 1999).

Reinventing Probation Council, 2000b

The foregoing statement provides a concise summary of what the Reinventing Probation Council addresses with their fifth strategy. Community members can be involved with all aspects of probation including developing policies, initiating programs, supervising offenders, and providing other needed services. A variety of configurations of citizens can become involved in the business of probation, including advisory boards, neighborhood associations, community justice centers or citizens' boards of directors, among others (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000b).

Citizens who are invited to participate in promoting public safety in their neighborhoods may fill a variety of roles. Crime watch groups, volunteers and mentors to probationers, community service monitors, members of victim impact panels, participants in sentencing and mediation groups, and volunteers on community reparative boards are some of the types of services citizens can render (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000b).

There are many good examples of developing working partnerships with communities, and the illustration in the box is provided as a sample.

Reinventing Probation Council,
2000b, p. 27

. . . [T]here is a pressing need to bring in the expertise of community-based, non-professionals as full participants in justice system processes if those outcomes most valued by the citizenry are to be achieved (Rhine and Hinzman 2000). . . . Ultimately, real partnering requires that professionals and non-professionals willingly share their expertise in a non-traditional, problem-solving and decision-making capacity (Clear and Karp 1998)

Not only must probation develop relationships with local citizens, but collaborative relationships with other service providers also are vital. Specific partnerships will vary by communities, but among those to be considered are law enforcement, other corrections programs, health and human services agencies, schools, faith organizations, and neighborhood groups. When working with such organizations it is advisable to work out agreements for resource sharing, information sharing, and joint strategies (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000b).

Five Community Justice Centers have been created by the Maricopa County Juvenile Probation Department located in areas with the highest concentration of juvenile offenders under supervision. The staff assigned to these centers cross division lines and work as a team with the surrounding community in community-organized cleanups, economic development, and the development of accessible and needed services within the neighborhood. Probation offices are used for tutoring, community and treatment groups,, and as a meeting place for Community Justice Committees. The latter involve 400 plus volunteers who meet in panels of three with a Juvenile Probation Officer, victims, and individual offenders and their families. The committees seek to achieve a consensus of the consequences for cases approved for diversion and supervise the completion of those consequences.

An often-cited example of collaborative relationships with other services providers is Operation Night Light in Boston through which police and probation have joined together with community groups to stem the tide of violence in the city. Dramatic results have been noted in the city's homicide rates.

Suggested Reading

- | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Justice Concepts and Strategies• Restoring Hope Through Community Partnerships: The Real Deal in Crime Control• Promising Victim-Related Practices and Strategies in Probation and Parole |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Program Examples

<p>Operation Night Light in Boston brings together police and probation with community groups to stem the tide of violence in the city. Dramatic results have been noted in the city's homicide rates.</p>

<p>In the Sixth Judicial District of Iowa the Community Corrections Improvement Association was developed as a private nonprofit foundation to develop and operate proactive and preventive programs, including neighborhood organizations.</p>

<p>Community Corrections Advisory Committee Multnomah County, OR</p>

<p>Partners Against Crime (Mentoring Program) Detroit, MI</p>

Strategy #6: Establish Performance-Based Initiatives

Successful probation agencies must develop and implement strong program models. This paper has advocated the integration of four perspectives as foundations for program development, and these have been woven into the strategies recommended by the Reinventing Probation Council:

- *Community justice* which builds partnerships in the community to prevent crime, solve problems, and repair the harm crime has caused.
- *Restorative justice* which emphasizes holding offenders accountable for making amends for their unlawful behavior in order to return crime victims and communities, as nearly as possible, to their condition before the crime occurred.
- *Balanced Approach* which includes goals of community protection, offender accountability, and offender competency development.
- “*What works*” that stresses research-based strategies to change the behavior of high-risk offenders.

Reinventing Probation
Council, 2000b, p. 29

Reducing the threat of risk or harm presented by offenders *requires* the development of programmatic interventions that connect offenders to environments that have prosocial supports and structure.

These are, admittedly, overlapping constructs. While each approach alone partially addresses the development of effective probation programming, combined they provide a comprehensive direction for probation agencies. The sixth strategy proposed by the Reinventing Probation Council (2000b) stresses the development and implementation of performance-based initiatives. To achieve this aim, agencies must take two courses of action:

- draw from the research literature on effective programs, and implement those approaches that have been proven to be successful, and
- evaluate programs that are implemented within the agency to ensure they are carried out appropriately and are achieving their stated purpose and goals.

Program Examples

Georgia Board of Pardons & Parole
Atlanta, GA

Dakota County Community Corrections
Hastings, MN 55033

Effective Programs

Community Justice. Employing the concepts of community justice is relatively recent in probation. Therefore, few programs have generated formal research findings. However, Operation Night Light in Boston has shown some dramatic success. Troubled neighborhoods in Boston were experiencing significant crime problems including homicides and serious assaults due to gang infiltration, widespread cocaine trafficking, and proliferation of trade in guns. Probation officers teamed with police officers began supervising probationers closely by making home visits during evening hours to assure youth were complying with curfews and other orders of probation. The police-probation teams also made their presence known in troubled neighborhoods and citizens became more aware that they were available to deal with unlawful behavior. At the same time, outreach workers were hired to intervene with youth in the neighborhoods, job assistance programs for youth were developed, faith-based programs were instituted, and personal advocacy on behalf of individual youth began to occur. Although a combination of multiple factors are responsible for the outcomes and cannot be contributed to any one component of the approach, the effects of these interventions were dramatic. Homicides in Boston fell from a high of 98 deaths during 1993 to 43 in 1997. Among young people (16 and under) homicides declined from 16 in 1993 to only one in 1996 and one in 1997 (Corbett, 1998).

A federal initiative, Weed and Seed, used a community policing design but was built on principles similar to those for community probation practice. The aims of the program were to build stronger links between citizens and government, solve neighborhood problems, and restore the harm done to communities and victims by crime. Strategies involved law enforcement efforts to remove violent offenders, drug traffickers, and other criminals from targeted areas, infusion of human services and neighborhood revitalization efforts to prevent and deter further crime in the targeted areas, and enhanced community-police partnerships in solving community problems. Evaluation data in 1995 showed declines in major crimes in most of the target areas after one year of Weed and Seed operation (Community Justice Exchange Website, www.communityjustice.org).

Balanced and Restorative Justice. Like community justice, full implementation of Balanced and Restorative Justice programs in probation are relatively recent, and evaluations are limited. However, there is both statistical and anecdotal evidence of the effectiveness of Balanced and Restorative Justice approaches. One study targeted the Restorative Resolutions program in Winnipeg, Canada. Offenders were referred to the program if they were likely to be incarcerated for at least six months. Community-based supervision plans were developed with input from victims. More than 90 percent of the 174 offenders in the

program were classified as medium to high risk. Thus, the program was accurately targeting offenders for community supervision who otherwise would have been incarcerated. Victim offender meetings, restitution payments to victims, and community service work were the most frequently used methods to involve victims and have the offender repair the harm caused by the crime. Many victims were reluctant to meet with offenders, so only 25 victim-offender meetings occurred. However, besides these 25 victims, offenders made written apologies to 58 other victims. More than three-fourths of the victims (78.6%) wrote victim impact statements also. Half of the victims received restitution payments, and community services was applied to 96 percent of the offenders. Offenders from the program were followed for a year and were matched with similar offenders who were inmates or probationers not taking part in the program. Only 5.3 percent of the program clients were convicted of a new offense during the study period, compared with 16.1 percent of the comparison group. Offenders in the program also were involved in rehabilitative treatment programs (Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, & Rooney, 1998). This program clearly was successful in addressing the goals of the balanced approach including accountability to victims for the harm caused by the crime, community safety as evidenced by reduced recidivism, and competency development through the rehabilitative component.

What Works. The research supporting the effectiveness of this approach has been cited throughout this document. The most effective programs in reducing offender recidivism target high risk offenders with programming to address dynamic risk factors, such as antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs, delinquent and criminal peers, self-control, self-management and problem-solving skills. To obtain the most promising outcomes, it is important to match offenders' learning styles with appropriate program placements. These interventions are most effective when staff working with offenders are respectful, caring, concerned, interested, enthusiastic, and engaged (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000b).

Suggested Reading
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Results-Driven Management: Implementing Performance-Based Measures in Community Corrections

Program Evaluations

To continue improving the probation field, programs need to evaluate program processes and outcomes. It is only by learning from both successes and failures that progress is made.

Process evaluations examine program components to determine whether or not they were implemented properly. Outcome evaluations measure the success or failure of the program in achieving its goals. Five steps are involved in an evaluation process (Boone & Fulton, 1995):

- State goals in behavioral terms
- Develop measurement instruments
- Collect data
- Interpret findings
- Make recommendations.

Four types of outcome evaluations can be designed. The most appropriate depends on factors such as time, money, and expertise available. It is important to select designs with care to ensure that the evaluation findings reflect the intended purpose and will be accepted and understood by the appropriate audiences. These designs include (Boone & Fulton, 1995):

- before and after comparisons that measure criteria before and after program interventions;
- time/trend projections of pre/post program that measure criteria over several intervals and project future trends;
- cohort comparisons, that measure changes in similar groups where one receives the program services and the other group does not receive them; and
- randomized evaluations in which identical groups are randomly assigned to receive the program or not to receive the program's interventions.

Strategy #7: Cultivate Strong Leadership

Leadership requires the capacity to set a course toward a goal and then draw others along the same path through persuasion, influence, and power.

*(Reconnecting Youth & Community:
A Youth Development Approach, 1996, p. 8)*

Leadership is not synonymous with hierarchical position within an organization. Not all administrators and managers are effective leaders. However, to undergo change effective leadership is required. Someone (or a small group of individuals) always has to step forward to provide guidance and direction for change. Leadership provides vision and focus for growth. Strong, confident leaders draw on others' talents and skills and empower them to think creatively (*Reconnecting Youth & Community. . .*, 1996, p. 7).

Productive leadership requires sound principles, effective analysis, and a belief that change requires the involvement of others. Leaders must inspire and motivate others. They provide a vision that focuses on the larger picture and on long-term growth and development. There are several characteristics required for leadership (Reconnecting Youth & Community. . . , 1996, p. 7):

- Leadership requires courage. Most truly challenging situations demand not only imaginative solutions but also the tenacity to carry them out.
- Leadership is not easy although the results of true leadership make future efforts easier over time.
- Leadership requires the ability to listen, as well as an openness to, and respect for, diversity and difference of opinion.
- Leadership can feel demanding and isolating but results in a sense of belonging and community.
- Leadership requires the ability to put aside personal bias or desires in decision-making.
- Leadership is the ability to make decisions, live with the consequences, accept the blame, share the credit, and learn from the experience.

Clear (1999) asserts that correctional leaders should embrace three major attitudinal shifts to be effective in the process of reinventing probation:

- Change from the “get tough” rhetoric often typical of public policy statements on corrections to an agenda that targets the community’s quality of life. This moves the discourse toward the goal of correctional work and away from the means of punishment.
- Move beyond professionalism to embrace the democracy of citizen partnerships. While not denying the importance of professionalism, claims to special expertise can exclude meaningful citizen participation or involvement in decision-making.
- Encourage staff to go beyond the standard routines of offender case management to the creativity of problem-solving.

Reinventing Probation
Council, 2000b, p. 33

Effective leadership is an indispensable element when it comes to reengineering the field of probation. It requires a willingness to create something of public value by steering an agency toward a vision that energizes and a philosophy of management that empowers all staff. Ultimately, it demands that those who are entrusted with the mantle of leadership embrace accountability for producing outcomes that matter.

Suggested Reading

- | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Don't Negotiate with Leprechauns: A Handbook of Management Principles which Promote Dynamic Change and Innovation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

